

REMARKS

I. INTRODUCTION

No new matter has been added. Thus, claims 1-36 remain pending in this application. It is respectfully submitted that based on the following remarks, all of the presently pending claims are in condition for allowance.

II. THE 35 U.S.C. § 112 REJECTIONS SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

Claims 1 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. (See 09/10/07 Office Action p. 3).

The Examiner rejected claim 1 for the term “the pixel data voltage” since it is not defined by the claim, the specification, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. (See 09/10/07 Office Action p. 3). Applicants respectfully disagree.

In rejecting claim 1 the Examiner asserts that the term “pixel data voltage” is not one in which one of ordinary skill in the art would reasonably be apprised of. (See 09/10/07 Office Action p. 3). This, however, is incorrect. The term “pixel data voltage” is a term commonly used when referencing LCD technology. This is evidenced by its use in U.S. Patent No. 7,259,739 at column 1, line 62. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn and that claim is allowable.

The Examiner rejects claim 27 because of the term “a transistor,” which the Examiner asserts is unclear as to which transistor is being referred to. (See 09/10/07 Office Action p. 3). Applicants respectfully disagree. Claim 27 recites, “wherein a transistor (A_5).” The transistor is clearly defined as being A_5 , which is defined in the specifications at p. 19, ll. 9-10. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the 35 U.S.C. § 112 should be withdrawn and claim 27 is

allowable.

III. THE OBJECTION TO THE CLAIM SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

Claim 17 stands objected to for informalities. (See 09/10/07 Office Action p. 3).

The Examiner objected to claim 17 for reciting “the capacitor arrangement.” The Examiner asserts that the term should be “the capacitors arrangement.” (See 09/10/07 Office Action p. 3). Applicants respectfully disagree. The term “capacitor arrangement” as recited in claim 17 refers to the singular arrangement of all of the capacitors. When referring to an arrangement, the term in front is either singular or possessive, not plural as asserted by the Examiner. An example of this is the term “a flower arrangement,” it would be incorrect for the preceding to be referred to as “a flowers arrangement.” Therefore, Applicants submit that the objection should be withdrawn and that claim 27 is allowable.

IV. THE 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) REJECTIONS SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

Claims 1-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant’s Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter “AAPA”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,061,452 to Inoue et al. (hereinafter “Inoue”). (See 09/10/07 Office Action p. 4).

Claim 1 recites, “a data input to the pixel being provided to the junction between the first and second capacitors (C_1 , C_2) thereby to charge the second capacitor.” The Examiner asserts that this recitation of claim 1 is taught by Inoue in figure 5, elements 52 and 53. (See 09/10/07 Office Action p. 4). Applicants respectfully disagree.

In his comparison of Inoue to claim 1, The Examiner asserts that C_1 and C_2 from claim 1 are the same as capacitors 553 and 54 from Inoue. The Examiner further asserts that the data input into the system is done in figure 5 at the junction of 51 and 52. (See 09/10/07 Office Action p. 4). The junction of 51 and 52 in Inoue, however, is clearly at input transistor 53 and not in between capacitors 553 and 54. (See Inoue Figure 5). In contrast, claim 1 clearly recites,

“a data input to the pixel being provided to the junction *between the first and second capacitors* (C_1 , C_2).” Thus, Applicants submit that Inoue does not teach or suggest the invention as recited in claim 1. Applicants further submit that the AAPA does not cure the above-described deficiencies of Inoue with respect to claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 1 is allowable. Because claims 2-31 depend from, and therefore include all the limitations of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable for at least the same reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

Independent claim 32 recites, “charging a second capacitor (C_2) , in series with the first capacitor between the gate and source or drain of the drive transistor, to a data input voltage.” Applicants submit that claim 32 is allowable for at least the same reasons stated above with respect to claim 1. Because claims 33-36 depend from, and therefore include all the limitations of claim 32, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable for at least the same reasons given above with respect to claim 32.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all the presently pending claims are in condition for allowance. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Please direct all future correspondence to:

Paul Im, Esq.
IP Counsel

Philips Intellectual Property & Standards
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001
Phone: (914) 333-9602
Fax: (914) 332-0615
Email: Paul.im@philips.com

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Michael Marcín (Reg. No. 48,198)

Dated: December 04, 2007

Fay Kaplun & Marcín, LLP
150 Broadway, Suite 702
New York, NY 10038
Phone: 212-619-6000
Fax: 212-619-0276